

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	:	Hon. Michael A. Hammer
	:	
	:	Criminal No. 20-572 (KM)
v.	:	
	:	
	:	
WILLIS EDWARDS III	:	

ORDER

WHEREAS, on December 30, 2020, defendant Willis Edwards III (Brandon D. Minde, Esq. and Roy B. Greenman, Esq., appearing) made a motion, pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal of Procedure 41(g), for the return of certain property seized from defendant Edwards's residence in July 2016 (ECF Dkt. #27);

WHEREAS, on February 16, 2021, Rachael A. Honig, then Acting United States Attorney for the District of New Jersey (by Cari Fais and J Fortier Imbert, Assistant U.S. Attorneys, appearing), opposed defendant Edwards's motion and submitted a brief in opposition with two footnotes that were redacted, in part, because they referred to a matter then under seal (ECF Dkt. #32);

WHEREAS, on March 9, 2021, defendant Edwards replied to the Government's opposition to his motion (ECF Dkt. #36);

WHEREAS, on June 28, 2022, with defendant Edwards's consent, the Court held a hearing on the motion conducted by video-conference, which was attended by defendant Edwards, Mr. Greenman, and the Government, in advance of which: (1) the Government provided defense counsel with a version of its February 16, 2021 brief in opposition in which the above-referenced two footnotes were unredacted because the matter to which they referred was no longer under seal and (2) the Government notified the Court that: (a) with the exception

of two of defendant Edwards's cell phones, which are of evidentiary value in pending cases (the "two cell phones"), the parties had reached an agreement that the Government will return all other electronic devices seized from defendant Edwards's residence, subject to the parties' entering into a stipulation regarding the authenticity and chain of custody of such devices and any records contained in such devices; (b) the parties had not reached an agreement regarding the return of \$10,000 in cash that also was seized from defendant Edwards's residence (the "\$10,000 in cash"); and (c) thus, the scope of the June 28, 2022 hearing effectively had been narrowed to the parties' dispute about whether the two cell phones and the \$10,000 in cash should be returned to defendant Edwards;

WHEREAS, NOW THEREFORE, after consideration of the parties' written submissions, the parties' arguments at the June 28, 2022 hearing; and for good and sufficient cause shown and the reasons stated on the record by the Court;

IT IS, therefore, on this 5th day of July, 2022,

ORDERED that defendant Edwards's motion as it relates to the return of the two cell phones and the \$10,000 in cash is denied.



MICHAEL A. HAMMER
United States Magistrate Judge